

**Remarks**

This is a Response to the Official Action dated November 30, 2004.

**Status of Claims**

Claims 1-25 are currently pending in the Application.

This response amends Claims 1, 9 and 13 to clarify the claims and cancels Claims 17-25 without prejudice. Support for the amendments can be found in the Claims 17-19.

**Drawings Objections**

The Examiner objects to the drawings for allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the “height of the third reflecting protrusions is greater than the distance between the illumination tube and the first reflective protrusion” is not shown in the drawings. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s assertions.

Applicants submit that Figures 3 and 4 disclose the “height of the third reflecting protrusions is greater than the distance between the illumination tube and the first reflective protrusion.” Applicants respectfully note by way of an example and not of limitation that Figures 3 and 4 show that the height of the third reflecting protrusions 146, 147 is greater than the distance between the illumination tube 150 and the first reflective protrusions 142, 143. Hence, Applicants submit that the drawings show every feature of the invention specified in the claims and request that the objection be withdrawn.

**Specification Objections**

The Examiner objects to the specification for allegedly not providing proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that there is no description of the ““height of the third reflecting protrusions is greater than the distance between the illumination tube and the first reflective protrusion.””

Applicants submit that the specification has been amended to reflect that the height of the third reflecting protrusions is greater than the distance between the illumination tube and the first reflective protrusion as is shown in the originally filed Figures 3 and 4. No new matter has been added to the specification.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection**

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Figueroa (U.S. Patent No. 5,192,129) and further in view of Azuma (U.S. Patent No. 5,161,880).

Applicants submit that the Examiner has **not** established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants note:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success.

**Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure"

(emphases added) *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because Figueroa and Azuma do not teach each and every element as claimed in the present application. In particular:

**Claim 1**

Applicants submit that Figueroa and Azuma do not disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 1, as amended, of the present application:

"wherein the height of the third reflecting portions protruding from the second reflecting portions is greater than the distance between the illumination tube and the first reflecting portion"

In rejecting Claims 17-19, the Examiner asserts that Figueroa discloses a height of the third reflecting portions protruding from the second reflecting portions is greater than the distance between the illumination tube and the first reflecting portion. Applicants respectfully disagree.

According to Figueroa, the height of the elements 21<sub>2a</sub>, 15<sub>2a</sub> protruding from the element 12a or reflector 10a is smaller than the distance between the light bulb 1 and the element 27<sub>B</sub>. See FIG. 3 of Figueroa. Hence, Figueroa does not teach, disclose or suggest “wherein the height of the third reflecting portions protruding from the second reflecting portions is greater than the distance between the illumination tube and the first reflecting portion” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Applicants submit that the combination of Figueroa and Azuma does not teach each and every element as claimed in the present invention and the Examiner has **not** established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8 depend from Claim 1. “If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, in light of the above discussion of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claims 2-8 are also allowable.

#### Claim 9

Applicants submit that, at least for the reasons stated above, Figueroa and Azuma do not disclose, suggest or teach “wherein the height of the triangular protrusions protruding from the planar surfaces is greater than the distance between the illumination tube and the curved surface” as recited in amended Claim 9.

Applicants submit that combination of Figueroa and Azuma does not teach each and every element as claimed in the present invention and the Examiner has **not** established a

*prima facie* case of obviousness for the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10-12 depend from Claim 9. Therefore, in light of the above discussion of Claim 9, Applicants submit that Claims 10-12 are also allowable.

Claim 13

Applicants submit that, at least for the reasons stated above, Figueroa and Azuma do not disclose, suggest or teach “wherein the height of the second triangular protrusions protruding from the planar surfaces is greater than the distance between the illumination tube and the first triangular protrusion” as recited in amended Claim 13.

Applicants submit that combination of Figueroa and Azuma does not teach each and every element as claimed in the present invention and the Examiner has **not** established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 14-16 depend from Claim 13. Therefore, in light of the above discussion of Claim 13, Applicants submit that Claims 14-16 are also allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

August 3, 2005  
(Date of Deposit)

Susan Papp  
(Name of Person Signing)

Susan Papp  
(Signature)

August 3, 2005  
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 43,010  
LADAS & PARRY  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, California 90036  
(323) 934-2300